

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,623	02/18/2004	Takao Otsuka	Q79875	9092
7:	590 04/28/2005	EXAMINER		
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC			LOPEZ, MICHELLE	
2100 Pennsylva	nia Avenue, N.W.			
Washington, DC 20037-3213			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2721	

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/779,623	OTSUKA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Michelle Lopez	3721	

Defense the Filian of an Annual Duice	10,110,020	O TOOTET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Michelle Lopez	3721				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 April 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ejected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.75. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	llowable if submitted in a separate	, timely filed amendm	ent canceling			
For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) \( \subseteq \) will not be entered, or b) \( \subseteq \) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	·					
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>	ut before or on the date of filing a New Marker of the sufficient reasons why the affida	Notice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary			
P. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).						
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	it does NOT place the application i	in condition for allowa	nce because:			
<ul><li>12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13.  Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant contends that prior art Mueller fails to teach a packaging apparatus having the feature of selectively sorting the encased products to first and second paths. However, Examiner contends that Mueller does teach a packaging apparatus having the feature of sorting the encased products to first and second paths by "selectively sorting" the products in that they are separated into the two paths from a single filling machine. Contrary to applicant's arguments, the products that move through-enly that path 14 (or 16) are fed through only that path 14 (or 16) and not through both paths. Therefore, each article is "selected" into one of the two paths (as shown in col. 2; 36-43 and col. 3; 65-68).

2